this was the name of the administration of the nomad population, headed by a *tajša* < Chinese *tai-shih* "great preceptor," which was the title of the Buriat chiefs.[83] The offices called "stepnaja duma" were introduced, as part of Count Speranskyʼs reforms, in 1822.[84] Data on the first occurrence of the term *čast'* "police precinct" are lacking, but it occurs in Russian literature in the first half of the XIX century. Leaving the latter word out, it can be stated that the remaining two terms are relatively new. One of the oldest Russian words in the epic vocabulary is *ülinee* < Russ. *ulica* "street" which is attested in the XIV century.[85] Consequently, it could have been borrowed by the Buriats soon after Irkutsk had been founded (1661). Much newer words are *gubernija* (1710) and *duma* (or *stepnaja duma* since 1822). From the above chronology of the borrowings in question the conclusion can be drawn that the Buriat epics – which otherwise might be of considerably old age – have been constantly incorporating new elements, the most recent ones representing the Russian words quoted above. The *terminus post quem* is for them 1710 and 1822 respectively.

The overall conclusion from the present paper is that the Western Buriats have been influenced by the cities in their land to greater an extent than the Eastern Buriats, the Mongols in Outer Mongolia (which is now the People's Republic of Mongolia), and Oyrats. This might find its explanation in the fact that the Western Buriats had been semisedentary as early as in the XVII century. Thus, the Cossack *ataman* (chief) Perfil'ev described the Buriats living in the Angara area as sedentary and cultivating barley and buckwheat (1627).[86] The Eastern Buriats, the Mongols in Outer Mongolia, and the Oyrats remained nomads until recently. This may explain why the city is reflected in Western Buriat epics inspite of the fact that the first contacts of these Buriats with city life date from the middle of the XVII century, whereas the Mongols in Outer Mongolia had contacts with cities from the very beginning of their history. But they were nomads.

[83] Vladimircov, *op. cit.*, p. 138.
[84] *Istorija Burjat-Mongol'skoj ASSR*, Tom I, pp. 222–224.
[85] I. I. Sreznevskij, *Materialy dlja slovarja drevnerusskago jazyka*, Tom III, Sanktpeterburg, 1903, p. 1195.
[86] A. P. Okladnikov, *Očerki iz istorii zapadnyx burjat-mongolov (XVII–XVIII vv.)*, OGIZ, Leningrad, 1937, p. 33. Cf. *Istorija Burjat-Mongol'skoj ASSR*, Tom I, p. 59.

CAJ 25, 1981

THE ORIGIN OF TURKIC *BALÏQ* "TOWN"

by
DENIS SINOR
Bloomington, Indiana

Written sources and excavations provide irrefutable proof of the existence of large, permanent settlements in Inner Asia. Some of these were on a modest scale and cannot be traced easily. Others were true cities in the modern sense of the word, centers of trade, of artisanal or administrative activities. Some settlements of peoples as diverse as the Khazars, the Uighurs, the Kitans, or the Mongols would qualify as veritable townships. Yet it is obvious that in the course of their recorded history the great majority of Altaic peoples neither built nor resided in cities and that – with a few exceptions such as Old Bulghar – those that had been constructed were relatively short-lived. It is reasonable to assume that permanent settlements were not an essential feature of the culture of the Altaic peoples, a proposition I would be ready to reverse: the Altaic languages developed towards their present state of similarity among the non permanently settled peoples of Inner Asia.

An examination of Altaic words designating smaller or bigger permanent settlements – such as villages, hamlets, cities, towns – will show that most of them are borrowings from non-Altaic languages. A few examples to illustrate my point:

Persian *šahr* "city" appears in a great number of modern Turkic languages such as Turkmen *šəxer*, Kumyk *šagar*, Mod. Uighur *šəhər*, Kazakh *šəri*, Kirghiz *šār*.

Arabic *kal'a* was borrowed inter alia by Turkish *kale* "fortress," Nogay *kala* "city," Tatar *kale* "city," Kazakh *qala* "village," etc.

The old Sogdian *knδ* "city" survived in modern languages such as Azeri, Kumyk *gent* "village," Kazakh *kent*. As well known the word appears in a number of Central Asian toponyms such as Tashkent, Samarkand, Özkend, Ordukend, etc.[1] (Cf. Rakhmatov 1973; Bailey 1979, 51; Jarring 1964, 54: *beš kenti*.)

[1] The bibliographical references are listed at the end of the article. The

Not unexpectedly many Altaic languages use Russian loan words. Russian *gorod* "city" appears in the same form with the same meaning e.g. in Kazakh and Khakas. Russian *selo* "village" occurs in its unaltered form and with the same meaning not only in Nogay, Kazakh, Kirghiz, Khakas among the Turkic languages, but also in Evenki and Even. Less frequent are the borrowings of Russian *derevnja* "village" which appears e.g. in Kazakh, Khakas and also in Yakut *dêriêbnié*.

Some appellations are descriptive. Under this head belong Turkic words such as Mod. Uighur *qïšlaq*, Uzbek *qïšloq*, Kirghiz *qïstaq* for "village" though the original meaning of the word was "winter-quarters." Modern Mongol *suurin* "village" derives from *sayu-* "to sit." Semantically it is similar to English *settlement*. The Mongol word passed also into Tuvin *suur*.

* * *

There does exist a Turkic word which at first sight seems to belong to the original vocabulary: *balïq* "city." In Old and Middle Turkic *balïq* is the standard word for "city." Occurrences are listed in Clauson 1972, 335. The word appears also as a component in place names such as *Bešbalïq*, *Qanbalïq*, *Yangïbalïq*, etc. In a Tibetan text of the eighth century it is transcribed *pa-lig* as a component of *Ba-ker pa-lig* = *Baqïr balïq* "Copper city."[2] With the exception of archaic Sarïγ Yuγur – where according to Tenišev 174 it appears in the meaning of "wall, fence"– and Khalaj *baluq* "village" (cf. Doerfer 1975, 259), , *balïq* is not common in modern Turkic languages. It does not belong to the basic Common Turkic vocabulary, but it is an Old Turkic word which percolated into Middle Turkic and has never gained general acceptance in the other Turkic languages. There is no reason for considering it of Proto Turkic origin.

* * *

Kāšγarī distinguished between three words *balïq* in form but meaning respectively "fish," "mud," "city." One might speculate,

sources of Uralic and Altaic vocabulary are well known; they are given here only for rare or exceptional forms. The following abbreviations are used: CT. = Common Turkic; CTU. = Common Tunguz, FU. = Finno-Ugric, IE. = Indo-European, Ma. = Manchu, MO. = Mongol, MOAnc. = Ancient (Middle) Mongol, MOClass. = Classical Mongol, PA. = Proto Altaic, PFU. = Proto Finno-Ugric, PT. = Proto Turkic, PTU. = Proto Tunguz, PU. = Proto Uralic, TU. = Tunguz, TUR. = Turkic.

[2] Cf. Ligeti 1971, 177, with references to earlier studies. Uray 1979, 299–300 gives another instance of the Tibetan transcription of *balïq*.

as some did, that the eleventh century author somehow linked "mud" with "city." Were it so, his opinion would still not have a decisive value; Kāšγarī's etimologies are often incorrect. According to Professor Robert Dankoff – who very obligingly informed me of the relevant material found in his yet to be published edition of the *Dïvān* – "had Kāšγarī felt that the word meaning 'mud' was the basis, in any way whatsoever, of the word meaning 'fortress, city' he would have said so." (Letter of August 21, 1980.) Bang and Gabain 1929, 13, suggested that *balïq* "city" must "irgendwie" be connected with words meaning "Lehm." The example of *toy* given by them has since then lost its relevancy as it has become clear that of the two homonyms one does have the meaning of "clay" but the other stands for "camp" and, hence, "community" and not for "city." Doerfer II, 257 tentatively accepts the idea that "clay" was the original meaning of *balïq* and that the meaning "city" developed through the semantic change "clay wall" > "place surrounded by clay walls."

TUR. *balïq* has been equated routinely with MOClass. *balγasun* "city." The most extreme opinion is well put by Poppe 1960, 122 who derives both forms from an Altaic **balaka* "city." MOClass. *balγasun* appears as *bala'asun* in the *Secret History* and, according to Poppe, *balïq* derived from **balaka* through an intermediary form **balq*.[3] Between the Turkic and Mongol words Poppe postulates a genetic relationship and so does also Ramstedt 1957, 56. The latter quotes also MOClass. *balγan* "Gebäude, Städte," a word which – as it sometimes happens with forms cited by Ramstedt – does not seem to exist. Räsänen 1969, 60 accepts Poppe's equation. Others consider *balγasun* a very early Turkic loan in Mongol. This is the view expressed by Clauson 335 and shared also by Doerfer II, 257–258.

H. C. von der Gabelentz was the first, in 1832, to link *balïq* ~ *balγasun* with Manchu *falga* (p. 3). Hauer gives for Ma. *falga* ~ *falha* the following meanings: "1/ abgegrenzter Platz, Stelle; 2/ Stadtviertel; 3/ Amtsstelle, Geschäftszimmer, Büro; 4/ Grossfamilie, Sippe." TUR. *balïq* ~ MO. *balγasun* ~ Ma. *falga* are compared, among others, also by Ramstedt 1935, 31. Without further specifying his misgivings Doerfer I, 216 notes that the initial *f-* of the Manchu word may invalidate the equation. He probably has in mind the

[3] A final *-lq* would be most unusual for Turkic and, therefore, it would be better to posit **balqV*. It so happens that *balïq* "fish" has such a variant in Armeno-Kipchak *balχï*. Cf. Tryjarski 1968, 107.

fact that the usual reflexes of CT. *b-* are MO. *b-* and TU *b-*. E.g. CT. *boz* "grey" ~ MO. *boro* ~ Evk. *borong*; CT. *buγday* "wheat" ~ MO. *buγuday* ~ CTU. *buda* "millet" (Cf. Cincius 102); CT. *buγu* "deer" ~ MO. *buγu* ~ CTU. *buγu*. Of course these equations do not necessarily represent Proto Altaic roots. Thus, for example, the word for "wheat" was probably borrowed by Mongol and Tunguz from Turkic, whereas the word for "deer" could be a Mongol-Tunguz word borrowed by Turkic. From our present point of view – the clarification of the origin of *balïq* – all that matters is to identify the usual Tunguz reflexes of Turkic-Mongol *b-*.

There is at least one incontrovertible example of TUR. *b-* ~ MO. *b-* ~ Ma. *f-*: *baqši* ~ *baγsi* ~ *fakši* "teacher, religious, scribe." This, of course, is a Chinese loan word, taken over by Turkic whence it passed first into Mongol and then into Manchu. There is a learned excursus on *baqši* in Doerfer II, 271–277 where the Manchu word is derived directly from Chinese or from Sino-Korean. In this case straight borrowing from Chinese into Manchu seems impossible on account of the final *-k* of the first syllable. A Korean origin cannot be ruled out, though it would have to be shown that Ma. *f-* is a usual reflex of Korean *p-*.

The TUR. *b-* ~ Ma. *f-* correspondence is attested also in another, complicated case: TUR. *balγa* ~ Ma. *folgo/folho* "hammer." Clearly, *balγa* is not a Common Turkic word. It is unknown in Old and Middle Turkic but it is attested in Karakalpak, Uzbek *balga*, Kirghiz *balka* and some other dialects listed in Doerfer II, 256, where references can be found to the often repeated Sumerian, Akkadian and Indo-European etymologies of this word. Doerfer is wisely sceptical on this subject but also rejects, without indicating his reasons for doing so, the equation of *balγa* with Mongol *aluqa* "hammer" (accepted for instance by Poppe 1960, 11) and with the Tunguz group of words to which Ma. *folho* ~ *folgo* is usually reckoned. Cincius II, 313 gathers all the relevant forms, e.g. Evenki, Negidal *halka*; Oroch *halua* ~ *haluva*; Orok *palo* ~ *paloa* ~ *paloγa* ~ *paluγa*; Manchu *folho*, and equates them with MOAnc. *haluqa*, MOClass. *aluqa* "hammer." Perhaps Doerfer was puzzled with the first syllable *o* of the Manchu word which is somewhat unusual facing *a* but is not unparalleled. Cf. e.g. CTU. *talu* "birchbark" ~ Ma. *tolhon* (Cincius I, 61), CTU *hanggu-* "to ask" ~ Ma. *fonji-* (Cincius II, 314–315).

In my opinion the sound correspondences exemplified on TUR. *baqši* ~ Ma. *fakši* and TUR. *balγa* ~ Ma. *folgo/folho* justify the linkage of Ma. *falga* to TUR. *balïq*, MO. *balγasun*, but it may not be superfluous to say a word on the TUR. *b-* ~ Ma. *f-* correspondence.

It is probably safe to say that the "sound-law" deriving TUR. *Ø* ~ MOAnc. *h-* ~ PTU **p-* > Ma. *f-* from PA. **p-* is among the most hackneyed statements of comparative Altaic phonology. That it rests on foundations less solid than it had first appeared to its discoverers does not seem to diminish its appeal. The difficulty of proving this equation is well exemplified by Poppe 1960, 11–12. Of the thirty-two sets of correspondences given by him in support, only four contain any Turkic forms and even these are not all convincing. The hitch lies in the fact that MOAnc. *h-* ~ PTU **p-* > Ma. *f-* may perhaps continue a Proto Mongol-Tunguz or even PA. **p-* but the Turkic reflex of such a sound is *b-* rather than *Ø*. In his truly fundamental article on initial *h-* in Mongol Pelliot has called attention to "la survivance sporadique en turc, sous forme *b-*, de l'ancienne initiale labiale sourde généralement amuie" (1925, 245), and he did so specifically in connection with TUR. *balqa* ~ MOAnc. *haluγa*. On p. 262 of the same article Pelliot stated: "Peut-être faut-il admettre que, dès avant le processus **p* ou **φ* > *h-* > O, le **p-* ou **φ-* initial était passé en prototurc à *b-* dans un certain nombre de mots et s'est ainsi maintenu."

In Sinor 1944, 234–235 I further – though insufficiently – elaborated the matter, pointing out that in some instances PA **p-* was represented by *b-* not only in Turkic but also in Tunguz. I also advanced the rather daring hypothesis that Indo-European Uralic Altaic comparisons seem to show two sets of sound correspondences:

1/ IE. **p-* ~ Uralic ~ **p-* ~ Altaic **p-*[1] (PTU. **p-* ~ MO. **p-* > *h-* > *Ø* ~ TUR. *Ø*).

2/ IE. **bh-* ~ PU. **p-* ~ PA **p-*[2] (PTU. **p-* ~ MO. **p-* > *h-* > *Ø* ~ TUR. *b-*).

Of course many questions remain to be answered but this is not the place to do so. For our present purpose all we have to accept for granted is that 1/ in some cases TUR. *b-* continues PA. **p-*, 2/ in others we can establish a TUR. *b-* ~ MO. *b-* ~ Ma. *f-* correspondence which may very well be the result of borrowings rather than of genetic relationship. To this category would belong TUR. *balïq* ~ MO. *balγasun* ~ Ma. *falga*. In this case it seems likely that the Manchu word was borrowed from Mongol which is a loan from Turkic. The question now arises where is the origin of the Turkic word?

* * *

The Ugric languages have a common word for "village:" Vogul *pâβl, pēl, pāβl*, etc.; Ostiak *pēγət, pēγəl*, etc.; Hungarian *falu*. According to generally accepted opinion these forms continue a Proto Ugric **palγV* in which the quality of the second vowel is undetermined. (Cf. MSzFE. I, 180–181; TESz. I, 836–837.) Whether the Finnish word *palva-*, which appears as a component in some placenames, belongs to this group is an unresolved question of no direct relevance to our subject.

Sauvageot 1930, proposed two different etymologies for the same Ugric words. On pp. 17–18 he equated them with Turkic *ayïl, aul* "enclosure," MO. *ayil* "family, settlement," Ma. *falga* ~ *falha*, and hinted at the possibility of a connection with MO. *balγasun*. On p. 59, without further ado he linked Uralic **pVlk* with Ma. *falga* ~ *falha*, MO. *balγasun*, TUR. *balïq*. In 1934 in ETSz. s. v. *falu* Gombocz and Melich accepted the equation between the Ugric and Altaic *(balïq, balγasun, falga)* words. Räsänen 1955, 5 compared the Ugric words with TUR. *ayïl*, MO. *ayil*, Ma. *falga* ~ *falha*. He repeated the same etymology in Räsänen 1969, s.v. *ayïl* where he listed further Turkic data. I do not quite know how to interpret Menges 1954, 689 where, à propos of TUR. *ayïl* ~ MO. *ayil* he writes: "Steht in Parallele zu einer mong.-tung.-uralischen Verwandtschaftsreihe: Qytaň (Ljao) *wa-li* 'Lager,' Džürčen *eu-lā* 'Hof,' Mandžu *fala(n)*, *falga* 'Dorf (auch andered Bedtgn.),' Ungar. *fâlu*, St. *fâlv-* 'Dorf'." Sevortjan 1974, 84, s.v. *ayïl* lists the relevant etymologies without taking sides.

The equation proposed by Gombocz and Melich in the Etsz. is perfectly acceptable on condition that it is not considered rooted in Proto Uralic-Altaic. On the Uralic side the word is attested only in Ugric. On the Altaic side, as I have pointed out, *balïq* is not a Common Turkic word and, à fortiori, cannot be considered Common Altaic. It has been shown that TUR. *b-* does in some cases continue PA. **p-*. There is no reason why it should not continue a Uralic **p-* particularly if we consider that – in the case of *balïq*, attested only in Old Turkic – we may have to do with simple sound substitution, since Old Turkic did not have the voiceless labial explosive.

Only one question remains to be answered: what is the likelihood of a Ugric borrowing in Old Turkic, or – conversely – should we see in the Ugric forms a loan from Turkic? The second alternative is most unlikely since it presupposes a Turkic loan word in the Proto Ugric language, taken over before the dissolution of the Ugric unity.

The first alternative presents no such problems. Old Turkic has a number of Ugric and Samoyed loan words. In an article entitled "Samoyed and Ugric Elements in Old Turkic" and to be published in a *Festschrift* honoring Omeljan Pritsak, and also in Sinor 1965 I have listed some of these. Old Turkic *ay* "word," *sab* "word," *tan* "cold wind," *yunt* "horse" belong to the category into which I place the equation Ugric **palγV* ~ TUR. *balïq* ~ MO. *balγasun* ~ Ma. *falga*. The Turkic word is a loan from Ugric.

REFERENCES

Bailey, H. W. 1979. Dictionary of Khotan Saka. Cambridge University Press.

Bang, W. – Gabain, A. von –. 1929. Türkische Turfan-Texte. II. SPAW. XXII, 411–430.

Cincius, V. I. Sravnitel'nyj slovar' tunguso – man'čžurskikh jazykov. I–II, Leningrad 1975–1977.

Clauson, Sir Gerard. 1972. An Etymological Dictionary of Pre-Thirteenth-Century Turkish. Oxford, Clarendon Press.

Doerfer, Gerhard. Türkische und mongolische Elemente im Neupersischen. I–IV, Wiesbaden 1963–1975.

Doerfer, Gerhard. 1975. Altertümliche türkische Wörter im Chaladsch. I. Türk Dili Bilimsel Kurultayına Sunulan Bildiriler 1972, Ankara, pp. 256–260.

EtSz. Magyar Etymológiai Szótár, irta Gombocz Zoltán és Melich János. I–XII, Budapest 1914–1936.

Gabelentz, H. C. von der. 1832. Éléments de la grammaire mandchoue. Altenburg.

Hauer, Erich. 1955. Handwörterbuch der Mandschusprache. I–III. Tokyo – Hamburg – Wiesbaden.

Jarring, Gunnar. 1964. An Eastern Turki-English Dialect Dictionary. Lunds Universitets Årsskrift. N. F. Avd. 1, Bd. 56, Nr. 4.

Ligeti, Louis. 1971. À propos du "Rapport sur les rois demourant dans le nord." Études tibétaines dédiées à la mémoire de Marcelle Lalou. Paris. Pp. 166–189.

Menges, Karl Heinrich. 1954. Glossar zu den volkskundlichen Texten aus Ost-Türkistan. Ak. d. Wissenschaften und der Literatur, Abhandlungen der Geistes- und Sozialwiss. Kl., Nr. 14, pp. 681–817.

MSzFE. A magyar szókészlet finnugor elemei. Ed. by György Lakó and Károly Rédei. I–III, Budapest 1967–1978.

Pelliot, Paul. 1925. Les mots à H initiale aujourd'hui amuie dans le mongol des XIIIe et XIVe siècles. Journal Asiatique 1925, I, 193–263.

Poppe, Nikolaus. 1960. Vergleichende Grammatik der altaischen Sprachen. I. Vergleichende Lautlehre. Wiesbaden.

Rakhmatov, T. 1973. Etimologija toponima "Samarkand." Sovetskaja Turkologija 1973, 4, 43–50.

Ramstedt, G. J. 1935. Kalmückisches Wörterbuch. Helsinki.

Ramstedt, G. J. 1957. Einführung in die altaische Sprachwissenschaft. I. Lautlehre. Bearbeitet und herausgegeben von Pentti Aalto. MSFOu. 104:1.

Räsänen, Martti. 1955. Uralaltaische Wortforschungen. Studia Orientalia XVIII:3.
Räsänen, Martti. 1969. Versuch eines etymologischen Wörterbuchs des Türksprachen. Helsinki.
Sauvageot, Aurélien. 1930. Recherches sur le vocabulaire des langues ouralo-altaïques. Collection linguistique publiée par la Société de linguistique de Paris, XXX.
Sevortjan, Ė. 1974. Etimologičeskij slovar' tjurkskikh jazykov (obščetjurkskie i mežtjurkskie osnovy na glasnye.) Moskva.
Sinor, Denis. 1944. Indo-européen – ouralo-altaïque. T'oung Pao XXXVII, 226–244.
Sinor, Denis. 1965. Notes on the Equine Terminology of the Altaic Peoples. CAJ. X, 307–315.
Sinor, Denis. 1980 ? Samoyed and Ugric Elements in Old Turkic. Omeljan Eucharisterion: Essays presented to Omeljan Pritsak on his Sixtieth Birthday. Harvard Ukrainian Studies 3/4, 1979–80. (In proof stage.)
Tenišev, Ė. R. 1976. Stroj saryg-jugurskogo jazyka. Moskva.
TESz. A magyar nyelv történeti-etimológiai szótára. I–III, Budapest 1967–1976. Editor-in-chief: Lóránd Benkö.
Tryjarski, Edward. 1968. Dictionnaire arméno-kiptchak d'après trois manuscrits des collections viennoises. I, 1. Warszawa.
Uray, G. 1979. The Old Tibetan Sources of the History of Central Asia up to 751 A. D.: A Survey. In: Prolegomena to the Sources on the History of Pre-Islamic Central Asia, ed. J. Harmatta. Budapest. Pp. 275–304.

DIE STRUKTUR DER ERSTEN RESIDENZ DES MANDSCHUKHANS NURHACI

von
GIOVANNI STARY
Venedig

Bevor Nurhaci, der Gründer des mandschurischen Kaiserreiches, im Jahre 1603 seine Residenz nach Hetu ala, dem späteren Yenden oder Hsing-ching, verlegte, wohnte er in einer „namenlosen Siedlung auf dem Šoli ala zwischen dem Chia-ha und dem Šoli-k'ou, acht *li* südlich von Hetu ala"[1]. In jener anonym gebliebenen Siedlung wurde im Jahre 1596 der damals schon mächtige Nurhaci vom koreanischen Gesandten Sin Ch'ungil besucht, dem wir nicht nur einen ausführlichen und historisch sehr wertvollen Bericht über die Lage im mandschurischen Kerngebiet und Nurhaci's Hofhaltung verdanken, sondern auch eine genaue Beschreibung der Siedlung selbst[2].

Dieses einmalige Zeitdokument wurde erst 1938 wiederentdeckt und ein Jahr später im Faksimile-Druck veröffentlicht[3]; eine gekürzte und revidierte Fassung des Berichts wurde den koreanischen *Shih-lu* des Königs Söncho beigefügt[4] und folglich in die japanische Sammlung von *Shih-lu*-Auszügen, *Mindai mammō shiryō*,[5] aufgenommen. Leider fehlen in beiden Quellen Sin Ch'ungil's Skizzen, die deshalb in der westlichen Literatur wenig bekannt sind.[6]

Nurhaci's erste Residenz war demnach eine von zwei Mauern geschützte kreisförmige Festung, in deren Mittelpunkt – von einem

[1] W. Fuchs, *Frühmandjurische Fürstengräber bei Liao-yang*, in Asia Major X/1 (1934), S. 120.
[2] Übersetzt und kommentiert von G. Stary, *Nurhaci e il suo regno tribale alla fine del XVI secolo*, in Serica Venetiana, I, 1981.
[3] Inaba Iwakichi, *Kōkyō Nidōkashi kyōrōjō*, Hsin-ching 1939; vgl. vom selben Autor *Shin Chuitsu shokei to zuki*, in Seikyū Gakusō XXIX (1939), sowie Ri Inyong, *Konchu kichong toki*, in Sintan Hakpo, X (1938).
[4] *Rijo Sŏncho sillok*, Kapitel 71.
[5] Abt. *Richō jitsuroku shō*, Band 13 (Kyoto 1958), S. 54–73.
[6] Nur eine Skizze ist abgebildet in *Sekaishi daikei*, Band 8 (Tokyo 1957), S. 242. Vgl. auch Wakamatsu Hiroshi, *Nurrhači*, Tokyo 1967, S. 90–93